

REMARKS

The Advisory Action mailed July 28, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully noted. As set forth in the Office Action mailed March 28, 2008, the pending claims, claims 1-3, were rejected and claim 4 was withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks and the interview of August 25, 2008.

Interview Summary of August 25, 2008

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's grant of the telephonic interview on August 25, 2008. During the interview, Applicants' representatives explained the instant invention in detail and explained how the art cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest numerous features of the claims. The Examiner is understood to have agreed that various features of the claimed invention were not fully appreciated. Therefore, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the finality of the Office Action mailed March 28, 2008 and further consider the claimed invention upon receipt of this Supplemental Response.

Again, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's time and thoughtful consideration.

As discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully urge that Nakajima (US 5,384,632), alone or in combination with Brown (US 20040095587) and PowerPoint, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Nakajima, Brown and PowerPoint fail to teach or suggest determining a layout in a writing space mode, settable by an operator, based on a top side position and a direction of a document.

The undersigned better understands how the Examiner interprets "layout" in a broad sense. However, even if the term "layout" is given a broad interpretation, the applied art still does not teach or suggest layout determination based on operator input to a document top side setting section, allowing the operator to designate the top side of a document. Applicants' preferred example of this is carried out by controls 242 and 243 shown in Fig. 11. Further, per claim 1, layout determination in Applicants' apparatus depends on document direction. The cited art do not teach or suggest a document direction judging section that plays a role in layout determination. Thus, the cited art do not teach or suggest Applicants' recited layout

determination section that determines a layout of the document image and writing space on a paper sheet, based on document top side position and direction.

Further, Applicants respectfully urge that the “2-in-1 mode” description at column 1, lines 53-63, of Nakajima is not analogous, as asserted by the Examiner, to “a writing space mode” of the present invention as claimed. Specifically, Nakajima discloses that both a notice of holding a conference and its agenda are recorded on a sheet of paper by using a 2-in-1 mode for some copies, while the notice is recorded only on one half of a sheet for the other copies, by not using the 2-in-1 mode. This is so that the other half is used for taking notes. Compared with Nakajima, Applicants’ writing space mode provides the operator with a huge range of options. Once entered, it requires the operator to chose from among the numerous possible layouts exemplified in Figures 2(a) - 7(h). It further prompts the operator to chose whether and what kind of separating line should appear (subject matter of claim 2) and whether and what kind of textual rules should apply (subject matter of claim 3) by means of controls 231-240, and controls 251-254. Nakajima’s disclosure comes nowhere near describing Applicants’ complex “writing space mode” controlled by the operator.

In addition, Applicants respectfully urge that the paper size feature of Figure 3 of Nakajima does not correspond, as asserted by the Examiner, to their “a document top side setting section” and “a document directing judging section” as claimed. Rather, Applicants submit that Figure 3 and the related description of Nakajima have nothing to do with setting the position of the top side and direction of a “document” to be reproduced. Instead, the disclosure of Nakajima relates to setting a copy “paper” or recording sheet on which the image of a document is to be recorded. Nakajima only mentions selection for paper size and direction; however, Nakajima does not disclose anything about setting (designating) a top side position of a document or judging the direction of the document.

Applicants respectfully urge that Brown and PowerPoint do not alleviate these many deficiencies of Nakajima. Nowhere do Brown or PowerPoint teach or suggest determining a layout in a writing space mode based on a top side position and a direction of a document. Nowhere do they teach the extent of capabilities given the operator by Applicants’ “writing space

mode". Thus, the combined disclosures of Nakajima, Brown and PowerPoint do not result in the claimed invention as a whole, and a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 032739 M 085.**

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: August 28, 2008

1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, #1130
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

MAM/SKS/cvj